## Dear Judge McMahon:

As you are aware, we represent certain Defendants in the above referenced matter. See Docket Entries 16, 17, 23. On November 21, 2014, the Hon. Castel ordered Defendants to show cause as to why a preliminary injunction should not be granted herein pursuant to Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure pendente lite and, among other things, that a hearing be held on Wednesday, December 10, 2014 at 11:00 AM. See Docket Entry 15. Additionally, we note that this Court set forth an Initial Pretrial Conference on Friday, December 12, 2014 at 11:45 AM. See Docket Entry 3.

In light of the foregoing – and because Defendants have a scheduling conflict on December 10, 2014 – the parties jointly seek to adjourn the December 10, 2014 hearing to be held in concert with the Initial Pretrial Conference scheduled two days later. Per Your Honor's Individual Practices and Procedures ("Rules"): (1) the original date is December 10, 2014; (2-3) there have been no previous requests for an adjournment; (4) Plaintiffs consent to this request for an adjournment; and (5) the requested adjournment does not affect any other scheduled dates.

Additionally, counsel for Plaintiff seeks an extension of time of one (1) day to submit their reply brief. Per the Court's Rules: (1) the original date is December 9, 2014 at 10:00 AM; (2) there has been one (1) previous request for an extension of time to file an answer; (3) this previous request was granted; (4) Defendants consent to this request for an extension of time; and (5) the requested extension of time does not affect any other scheduled dates. We thank the Court for its time and attention to this matter.

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 12/9/2014

CC: Opposing counsel (via e-mail).

Respectfully submitted,

/s Emanuel Kataev, Esq.
Emanuel Kataev, Esq.
Milman Labuda Law Group, PLLC.